

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA :
: NO. 3:18-CR-0097
v. :
: (MARIANI, J.)
ROSS ROGGIO, and :
ROGGIO CONSULTING, LLC, :
Defendants. :

**GOVERNMENT'S IN LIMINE MOTION TO PRECLUDE THE
DEFENDANT FROM ASSERTING A DURESS DEFENSE**

The Government, by and through undersigned counsel,
respectfully moves *in limine* for the Court to issue an Order to preclude
the defendant from asserting a duress defense, and in support thereof
states:

1. Roggio's last continuance motion made oblique reference to possible foreign witnesses who could testify that Roggio acted under duress (Doc. 207 at ¶20).
2. Duress is an affirmative defense. *United States v. Grover*, 831 F. App'x 604, 607 (3d Cir. 2020) (citing *United States v. Alston*, 526 F.3d 91, 95 (3d Cir. 2008)). The defendant bears the burden of proving the defense of duress by a preponderance of the evidence. *Dixon v. United States*, 548 U.S. 1, 17 (2006). A defendant is entitled to present

the defense only after first making a *prima facie* showing of duress. *United States v. Naovasaisri*, 150 F. App'x 170, 173 (3d Cir. 2005). It is appropriate for a court to rule “pretrial on a motion to preclude a defendant from presenting a duress defense where the government contends that the evidence in support of that position would be legally insufficient.” *United States v. Miller*, 59 F.3d 417, 421 (3d Cir. 1995).

3. To establish that he was under duress when he committed the crimes, Roggio must show: (1) an immediate threat of death or serious bodily injury, (2) a well-grounded fear that the threat will be carried out, (3) no reasonable opportunity to escape the threatened harm, and (4) that he did not recklessly place himself in a situation in which he would be forced to engage in criminal conduct. *Grover*, 831 F. App'x at 607 (citing *Miller*, 59 F.3d at 422).

4. Since Roggio has failed to proffer any – much less sufficient – evidence to support those four elements, the Court should preclude him from presenting the defense at trial. *Id.* (citing *United States v. Bailey*, 444 U.S. 394, 416 (1980)).

Dated: April 10, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

GERARD M. KARAM
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

/s/ Todd K. Hinkley

Todd K. Hinkley
Assistant U.S. Attorney
Atty ID No. PA 68881
235 N. Washington Ave.
Scranton, PA 18503

KENNETH A. POLITE, JR.
Assistant Attorney General

/s/ Patrick Jasperse

Patrick Jasperse
Trial Attorney
Criminal Division
U.S. Department of Justice
Human Rights and Special
Prosecutions Section

MATTHEW G. OLSEN.
Assistant Attorney General

/s/ Scott A. Claffee

Scott A. Claffee
Trial Attorney
National Security Division
U.S. Department of Justice
Counterintelligence and Export
Control Section

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA :
: No. 3:18-CR-0097
v. :
: (Judge Mariani)
ROSS ROGGIO, and :
ROGGIO CONSULTING Co, LLC, :
Defendants. : (electronically filed)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that he is an employee in the Office of the United States Attorney for the Middle District of Pennsylvania and is a person of such age and discretion to be competent to serve papers.

That on April 10, 2023, he served a copy of the attached **GOVERNMENT'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE THE ASSERTION OF A DURESS DEFENSE** by electronic means to:

Gino Bartolai
bartolai@ptd.net

/s/ Todd K. Hinkley
Todd K. Hinkley
Assistant United States Attorney

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA :
: No. 3:18-CR-0097
v. :
: (Judge Mariani)
ROSS ROGGIO, and :
ROGGIO CONSULTING Co, LLC, :
Defendants. : (electronically filed)

CERTIFICATE OF NON-CONCURRENCE

The undersigned hereby certifies that he attempted to speak to Gino A. Bartolai, Esquire, counsel for Ross Roggio concerning the defendant's concurrence/non-concurrence in the attached motion *in limine*. Attorney Bartolai, indicates that the defense does not concur in the attached motion.

/s/ Todd K. Hinkley
Todd K. Hinkley
Assistant United States Attorney